

REMARKS

This paper is being submitted in response to the Office Action mailed in the application on June 27, 2005. Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 14-20, 22-40 and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 21 and 41 have been amended. No fees are believed to be due for the filing of this Amendment. However, if necessary, please charge any claim fees or other fees for entry of this Amendment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3415.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 (3 pages listing documents AA - AO) that was submitted by applicants with an Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 11, 2005.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 1-9, 14-17, 19-29, 34-37 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Kirani et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0016818). The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 10, 18, 30 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kirani et al. patent in view of Naylor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,642). The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 11 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirani et al. and Naylor et al. as applied to claim 10, further in view of Toyoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,107). The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 12, 13, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirani et al. in view of Barber (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,777). Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 14-20, 22-40 and 42 have been cancelled, rendering the Examiner's rejections thereto as moot. With respect to applicants' remaining pending claims, as amended, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 21 and 41, applicants' independent claims have been amended to better define applicants' invention. Particularly, applicants' independent claim 1, which is directed to an information providing apparatus capable of executing a communication via a network, has been amended to recite as follows, with added language substantially underlined:

1. An information providing apparatus capable of executing a communication via a network, comprising:
 - registering means for registering one or more terminal for each user;
 - reception means for receiving transmission information to a user;
 - decision means for deciding, from the one or more terminal registered for the user by said registering means, a destination terminal of the transmission information received by said reception means;
 - selection means for selecting a conversion module existing in an external device, which converts a format of the transmission information into a format which matches processing ability of the decided destination terminal;
 - designation means for sending the transmission information to the selected conversion module so as to make the selected conversion module convert the transmission information; and
 - transferring means for transferring the converted transmission information to the decided destination terminal.

Applicants' independent claims 21 and 41, which are directed to an information providing method and computer-readable storage medium which stores a control program for causing the computer to execute an information providing method, respectively, have been similarly amended.

According to the Examiner, the cited Kirani et al. publication discloses an information providing apparatus comprising: reception means (recipient 350 shown in FIG. 3) for receiving transmission information to a user (the recipient receives e-mail; page 7, par. [0095]); decision

means (SMTP mail server 315) for deciding, on the basis of user information of the user, a destination of the transmission information received by said reception means (the server 315 determines the type of device the recipient is using; page 5, par. [0065]); designation means (SMTP server 315) for designating conversion such that data contained in the transmission information matches a format of the destination (device capability determination includes determining a type and size of objects that the recipient's device can handle; page 5, par. [0066]); and providing means (SMTP mail server) for providing to the destination data whose format is converted by the designation of said designation means (mail server makes the adjusted or modified e-mail message available to the recipient; page 5, par. [0064]). Such does not teach or suggest, however, the invention as claimed in applicants' amended claims.

Applicants' invention is characterized by selecting a conversion module existing in an external device, which converts a format of the transmission information into a format which matches processing ability of the decided destination terminal, sending the transmission information to the selected conversion module in order to make the selected conversion module convert the transmission information, and transferring the converted transmission information to the decided destination terminal. In particular, according to the present invention, transmission information is sent to a conversion module (such as 300 and 300' in FIG. 1) which converts specific formats to other specific formats, such as, for example, converting an image from TIFF format to JPEG format, so that it can be handled by the recipient at the destination terminal. The conversion module to which transmission information is to be sent is selected based on the particular settings of the recipient, which may be accepted by setting module 500 and stored in net database 400. The converted information is then transferred to the recipient

via, for example, a Web server 700, portable terminal server 800, or FAX server 900, all of which are connected to media on which the conversion results can be represented, or the converted information may be transmitted directly to the destination terminal (Application, pages 14-15). Applicants' invention thus allows a recipient to easily observe, at a destination terminal such as a mobile telephone device or personal digital assistant, the converted information such as displayed, for example, in FIG. 25.

Applicant submits that the cited Kirani et al. publication, either alone or in combination with the Naylor et al., Toyoda et al. or Barber patents, does not teach or suggest the information providing apparatus, method or storage medium of applicants' amended independent claims. In particular, applicants' claims 1, 21, and 41 require registering one or more terminals for each user in a registering unit, receiving transmission information to a user, and deciding, from the one or more terminal registered for the user, a destination terminal of the transmission information received. Applicants' amended claims further require selecting a conversion module existing in an external device, which converts a format of the transmission information into a format which matches processing ability of the decided destination terminal, sending the transmission information to the selected conversion module so as to make the selected conversion module convert the transmission information, and transferring the converted transmission information to the decided destination terminal. Such features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Kirani et al. teach a system for delivery of e-mail attachments for disparate devices to a recipient (350 in FIG. 3) by which the attachment is removed from the e-mail message (such as by mail server 315 with plug-in message extractor 320 in FIG. 3) and changed

(reformatted/transformed), stored in a repository (325), and replaced in the e-mail message with a link (e.g. URL) that references the network address where the attachment is stored. The modified e-mail message is then transferred to the recipient, who can access the attachment using the link in the modified e-mail to the storage address (p. 5, par. [0064]). The reference also mentions that system can optionally perform automatic reformatting of the attachment and replace the original attachment with the automatically reformatted attachment.

Such operation in Kirani et al., however, is not a teaching or suggestion of selecting a conversion module existing in an external device, which converts a format of the transmission information into a format which matches processing ability of the decided destination terminal, sending the transmission information to the selected conversion module so as to make the selected conversion module convert the transmission information, and transferring the converted transmission information to the decided destination terminal, as required by applicants' amended claims. The other cited patents, i.e., Naylor et al., Toyoda et al. and Barber, fail to add anything to the Kirani et al. reference to change this conclusion.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims 1, 21 and 41, as amended, and their respective dependent claims, all patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandra B. Urban

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200

Alexandra B. Urban
Reg. No. 45,171
Attorney of Record